



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,361	12/10/2001	Gyorgy Lajos Kis	OP/V-30341B	6955
1095	7590	12/08/2003	EXAMINER	
THOMAS HOXIE NOVARTIS, CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ONE HEALTH PLAZA 430/2 EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080			JOYNES, ROBERT M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1615		
DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003				

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/016,361	KIS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Robert M. Joynes	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . 6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicants' Amendment and Declaration filed on September 25, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 12 recites that the composition is at a temperature of 120 degrees Celsius and is under 1.5 pars of pressure. It is unclear to the Examiner whether these are limitations that reflect conditions of the process of making the composition or if these are limitations of the storage of the composition, meaning if after its production the composition must be kept under these conditions. If the intent of the applicants were to recite these limitations as part of the method/process of making said composition, the claim would be better depending upon Claim 7.

Appropriate clarification or amendment is suggested.

Claim Objections

Claims 13 and 14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 13 depends upon Claim 12. Claim 12 recites that the amount of degradation product does

not exceed 0.23%. Claim 13 recites that the amount of degradation product is *about* 0.23%. The same situation occurs with Claims 5 and 14. Claim 5 recites the amount of degradation product does not exceed 0.03% while Claim 14 recites the amount of degradation product is *about* 0.03%. The dependent claims broaden the scope of the parent claims and therefore do not further limit the parents from which they depend. The Examiner interprets the term “*about*” to mean that the limitation can be within approximately 10% above or below the specific limitation recited. Therefore by saying *about*, the claim would or could include a limit outside of 0.23% or 0.03% respectively. Appropriate correction is suggested.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,455,547. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because U.S. Patent No. 6,455,547 teaches a composition comprising a salt of ketotifen at a concentration of 0.0345%, glycerol at a concentration of 2.125% and benzalkonium chloride at a concentration of 0.01%. The composition further contains an antioxidant. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prepare an ophthalmic solution containing ketotifen, glycerol and benzalkonium chloride in the specific concentrations recited in the instant claims. The addition of the antioxidant does not materially change the composition of the instant claims and is therefore rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,455,547.

Applicants have filed a Terminal Disclaimer that obviates the previous double patenting rejection over U.S. Patent No. 6,395,756.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Due to the new grounds for rejection, this action is deemed non-final.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Joynes whose telephone number is (703) 308-8869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 8:30 - 6:00, alternate Fri. 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3592.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Robert M. Joynes
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1615
December 4, 2003


THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 1600